

REMARKS

In the Office Action¹, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, and 12-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; rejected claims 1, 12, 14, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2003/0097211 to Carroll et al. ("*Carroll*"); rejected claims 2 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Carroll* and U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2004/0210363 to Kataghishi ("*Kataghishi*"); and rejected claim 13 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Carroll* and U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2005/0203684 to Borgesson ("*Borgesson*").

Applicants have amended claims 1 and 14. Claims 1, 2, and 12-17 remain pending.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, and 12-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, because the claims "fail[] to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention" (Office Action at page 2).

Applicants amended independent claims 1 and 14 to recite "the onboard apparatus" instead of "the navigation system." Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1 and 14, and claims 3, 12, 13, and 15-17 that depend from claims 1 and 14, under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Carroll*.

¹ The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Claim 1, as amended, recites an apparatus including, for example, “means for automatically getting vehicle model information from the vehicle by determining a shape of a connector used to attach the onboard apparatus to the vehicle.” *Carroll* does not disclose at least the claimed getting means.

Carroll discloses a “measurement device [] may be . . . a connector for connecting to an on-board signal outlet, such as OBD-II, to receive diagnostic code.” *Carroll* also discloses, “a user interface asking the user to input information related to vehicle model and make year.” *Carroll* does not disclose “getting vehicle model information from the vehicle by determining a shape of a connector used to attach the onboard apparatus to the vehicle” (emphasis added), as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, *Carroll* does not anticipate claim 1. Claim 12 depends from claim 1, and is thus allowable over *Carroll*, for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 14, as amended, recites an apparatus including, for example, “getting means for automatically getting vehicle model information from the vehicle by determining a formed position of a connector used to attach the onboard apparatus to the vehicle.” *Carroll* does not disclose “getting vehicle model information from the vehicle by determining a formed position of a connector used to attach the onboard apparatus to the vehicle” (emphasis added), as recited in claim 14.

Accordingly, *Carroll* does not anticipate claim 14. Claim 16 depends from claim 14, and is thus allowable over *Carroll*, for at least the same reasons as claim 14.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 2 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Carroll* and *Kataghishi*. A *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

Claims 2 and 15 depend from claims 1 and 14, respectively, and are thus allowable over *Carroll*, for at least the same reasons as claim 1 and claim 14, respectively. *Kataghishi* does not repair the noted deficiencies of *Carroll*, because *Kataghishi* fails to disclose the getting means of claim 1 or claim 14.

Accordingly, *Carroll* and *Kataghishi* fail to render subject matter of claims 2 and 15 obvious.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 13 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Carroll* in view of *Borgesson*. A *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

Claims 13 and 17 depend from claims 1 and 14, respectively, and are thus allowable over *Carroll*, for at least the same reasons as claim 1 and claim 14, respectively. *Borgesson* does not repair the noted deficiencies of *Carroll*, because *Borgesson* fails to disclose the getting means of claim 1 or claim 14.

Accordingly, *Carroll* and *Borgesson* fail to render subject matter of claims 13 and 17 obvious.


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: January 23, 2008

By: 
Eli Mazour
Reg. No. 59,318